DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 321 CG 003 897

By-Gurin, Arnold; Perlman, Robert

Final Report on the Community Organization Curriculum Development Project.

Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date 23 Jan 69
Note-29p.; Paper was presented at the Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education, Cleveland, Ohio, January 23, 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
Descriptors-Community Organizations, *Education, *Graduate Study, *Professional Education, Social Problems, *Social Work

The Community Organization Curriculum Development Project, sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education, has suggested a core curriculum for the teaching of community organization in social work schools. The key issue was how the practitioner could be more effective in meeting current social problems. Recommendations included foundation and practice courses. The former, designed to offer background knowledge, would consist of social science, social research, social welfare and policy and the profession of social work courses. The focus would be on social behavior and institutional analysis. The latter, designed to prepare the student to perform in the field, would include both survey and specialized courses on community organization, social planning, field work and seminars. The Council found the traditional two or three days in the field unrealistic. The flow of work in community organization is irregular, so it was recommended that the field assignment be programmed in relation to the tasks to be undertaken. The Council also suggested maximum scope for student options within the curriculum. (LS)

ED029321

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Prepared for presentation at the Annual Program Meeting,
Council on Social Work Education, Cleveland, January 23, 1969

by

Arnold Gurin and Robert Perlman

For three years our Project staff has hoped that this final report would be an anti-climax. It is gratifying that we have achieved our goal with those of you who shared in the development of our findings and recommendations, with many who have discussed our thinking in other meetings, and with some who have already begun to implement the Project's suggestions. By design, there are no big surprises left to unveil today but there is a purpose to be served by presenting a coda or recapitulation that brings together the three main themes of the Project's work: the concepts about practice that we evolved; the recommendations on curriculum; and the recommendations on field work. First, however, a few words about the evolution of the Project.

The origins of the Project six years ago in a meeting of social work faculty and governmental officials in Chapel Hill reflect the demands of the times which called the Project into being. New programs were emerging which were similar to and

CG-003897

different from older community organization operations. They were predominantly governmental and thus more heavily involved in politics. They were motivated by a missionary zeal directed toward social problems and toward finding new and better techniques. For all the disappointments of the last few years the community action programs initiated by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency had an impact on the professional fields which they undertook to shake up.

At Chapel Hill the challenge was presented to social work to supply people with more and better organizational and planning skills to man programs of innovation and institutional change. It was appropriate that the demand should be made of social work because of its historic commitments as well as its major contribution to the development of community organization as a discipline. But it was also clear that substantial further development would have to take place if social work was to meet these new and broader responsibilities. The year before the Chapel Hill meeting the Council on Social Work Education had adopted a policy statement that gave community organization the same status as casework and group work. The schools were represented there by a group of community organization teachers interested in strengthening the curriculum and meeting the demands not only for large numbers of new workers but for workers who could function in new roles as community organizers, policy-makers and social planners.

In 1965, after a period of planning, consultation and exploration, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency made a grant to the Council, which arranged to have the Project carried out at Brandeis. Our charge was to develop curriculum for the teaching of community organization in social work schools and we began with a feeling of responsibility to both education and practice, a desire to work toward a better fit between the two, and a determination to engage in a continuing dialogue with both. By mid-1965, you will recall, practice and practitioners were being pulled and pushed and challenged by America's discovery of its own poverty, the closely-related beginnings of the Negro revolution, the Civil Rights movement, and the explosion of government programs in public welfare, education, mental health, and other fields. Perhaps, looking back, it was the best of times in which to carry out our decision to examine practice in the real world.

It was neither possible nor really desirable to start from a careful, precise definition of the boundaries of community organization practice. We cast our nets wide and sought opportunities to talk with workers in all kinds of agencies and all types of jobs. We did not limit our discussions to people trained in social work. We strayed beyond what some people consider the limits of social welfare. The considerable amount of field work carried out by the Project staff and by a research firm was rewarding and frustrating. At one of our early visits with a group of senior

officials in a Federal agency, one of their number--who turned out to be a Brandeis graduate--opened the meeting logically enough by asking us for our definition of community organization. We replied that we had none, but that we wanted to understand the nature of the problems with which people were dealing, the opportunities and constraints operating in their situation, and their thought processes as they grappled with these problems.

Parallel with this reconnaissance of practice, we talked with social work schools about their problems in teaching community organization, in the light of trends in social work education, including the very rapid increase in the number of students interested in this field and the emerging differences in their interest and backgrounds from the majority of social work students in recent decades. As we gathered information and impressions from both field and school and as we uncovered issues and ideas, we fed them back through a series of meetings and workshops with the Project's Advisory Committee, the Board of the Council, conferences with deans and community organization instructors, and groups of practitioners.

The Project's written product which is now being completed will consist of five documents. The final report, dealing primarily with curriculum, will be published by the Council, together with a monograph on practice courses, field instruction and application training. These two documents will be distributed by the Council

within the next few months. Third, a survey which is a follow-up of the study of social work students conducted a few years ago by Dr. Arnulf Pins, will describe characteristics of students and factors affecting their choice of social work and of a concentration within it. Fourth, a textbook on community organization and social planning, addressed to beginning students and to practitioners, will be published jointly by the Council and a commercial publisher early in 1970. The fifth publication will be a casebook keyed to the textbook and scheduled for appearance at the same time. It has been agreed that following the publication of the general curriculum report and the monograph on practice courses and field work, the Council itself will be the most productive channel for the consideration of these materials by social work schools and plans are now being made for a systematic program of consultation with Council constituents.

This attempt to summarize the outcome of our work must begin with the description and conceptualization of practice that we evolved in the course of the Project. The key issue which was posed for us was how practitioners could be more effective in meeting the critical social problems of our times. One approach that was vigorously advanced was to organize low income neighborhoods in order to increase their social and political influence and power so that they could obtain greater control over the social institutions affecting them. At the other end of the spectrum

emphasis was placed on large scale governmental programs, rationally planned to provide services and open opportunities for deprived people. These positions and others are a mixture of political analysis and ideological convictions which proponents of the various points of view seek to have adopted as the values of the profession.

We have arrived at a position which, while eclectic, is based on our own belief in the importance of the struggle to improve the conditions of life for all members of society and to eliminate inqualities in opportunities based on race and socio-economic status as well as our belief in the freedom of people to work for changes toward these goals by participating in decision-making at every level of our national life. Moving on from these value commitments, we have found it reasonable to describe this as a field of practice which has a measure of unity as well as certain patterned variations within it. It was not entirely an arbitrary decision on our part to call this field "community organization and social planning," for, to the extent that there is some agreement on the meaning of terms, these represent two significant historical streams. Community organization has had a primary concern for enhancing relationships among people and between people and the social institutions set up to serve them. The other strand, planning, has concentrated on improving social provisions and bringing about a more equitable distribution of goods and services.

In reality of course these two goals of improved social relationships and better social provision have been combined in most efforts to reduce or eliminate social problems. The history of these efforts reflects the main social characteristics of this country--its heterogeneity and the competition and conflict over both status and welfare; the emphasis on voluntarism side by side with the increasing use of government to address social problems; and the variety of ideological positions from those calling for fundamental structural change in society to those working for improvements in the operation of existing institutions. This great diversity in America's attempts to cope more effectively with its social problems persists today and any formulation of concepts about practice in this field must encompass this diversity.

We found however that the approach of various writers to conceptualizing practice has been to develop a methodology that was related to a particular set of goals and circumstances. One of the most popular of these was the "integration" model of Murray Ross which emphasized the enabling role of the practitioner in helping people to identify their needs and develop means of meeting them. Another was the "planned change" model of Lippitt and his collaborators who applied concepts of small group theory to the community as a "client" whose behavior was subject to change through interpersonal influence. More recently, greater emphasis has been placed by writers like Robert Morris on "rational planning and problem-solving."

Our examination of practice has persuaded us that there is no single methodology that fits all the dimensions of this field and that there is little consistency in the extent to which the various dimensions of practice are correlated with one another. Thus, a particular kind of structure is not necessarily associated with a specific purpose or ideology, nor does it require one set of strategies or the performance of certain roles by the practitioner. For example, an organization sponsored by a client group may be directed toward self-help or toward organizational change; it may engage in educational or conflict tactics; it may have an ameliorative or a revolutionary ideology.

There is another reason for emphasizing the many dimensions of the field rather than seeking an overall theory. That is the dynamic nature of practice at the present time and the difficulty as well as the undesirability of setting firm boundaries around its functions. There is a tendency in the models that have been proposed to identify professional practice with one or another of the present approaches. But to speak only of diversity and of the many facets of practice is to court chaos. There is an underlying unity to this field which rests on several points. First, the activities subsumed under community organization and social planning are concerned with the planning and implementation of changes to cope more effectively with social problems. Social change, then, is the ultimate purpose of all activities in this field. Second, the achievement of specific change goals often

requires the use of several methods if the hoped-for results are to be achieved. For instance, recent studies of neighborhood organization work show that solutions to urban social problems cannot come from the mobilization of neighborhood residents alone, but must be accompanied by programs that distribute resources and services needed to deal with these problems. On the other hand, program planners in fields such as health, education, welfare, housing and employment are finding it increasingly necessary to be concerned with a whole range of implementing measures, including the organization of constituents to support the program and of consumers to avail themselves of benefits.

Third, the unity of the field derives from the systemic relationships among practitioner roles. Though they may be located in different settings, the organizer-developer, the planner, and the social actionist impinge upon one another in a multiplicity of ways as they pursue their respective efforts to deal with social problems. Their functions are intertwined in such a way that all need to take account of one another in determining their goals, strategies, and methods. This systemic quality justifies looking at the different models of practice as belonging within a unified field.

But what is the stuff of this practice? With what elements does it work? There has been a tendency to answer these questions in ideological terms by reiterating the valued goals of practice.

But while values are necessary in dealing with these questions they are not sufficient. We think of community organization and social planning as processes of resolving social problems by redistributing three elements: service functions, resources, and decision making power. Practice is concerned with the redistribution of these elements and with the issues inherent in each.

1. Service functions - Where and by whom are different services to be performed? To what geographical units, governmental or voluntary, of what size, is responsibility to be assigned for specific functions in health, education, income maintenance, social services, manpower development, community relations, and other social needs?

2. Resources - How are money, manpower, and other scarce resources to be distributed among various service functions and organizations?

3. Decision-making power - Who is to exercise control over policies, programs and resources and how are these responsibilities to be distributed among different groups and levels of organization in the society?

Building on the views presented thus far, we offer this as a working definition of practice.

> Community organization and social planning refer to a field of activity in which organizational methods of intervention are used to meet social needs and to counteract social problems by finding rational and feasible ways of changing the distribution of functions, resources and power. Its activities include organizing people to act together on common needs and problems as well as devising programmatic measures to meet their objectives.

These activities are bound together in a common enterprise in which planful approaches to the solutions of problems are fused with the mobilization of people's capacities to deal with their problems.

The specific goals of community organization and social planning are set by the values of the sponsoring groups and the responsibilities with which they are charged, either by governmental mandate or by voluntary action. The scope of such efforts varies widely, from relatively small-scale adjustments in service programs to large-scale and long-range changes in social institutions or in the distribution of social resources.

The processes of community organization and social planning include: fact-finding as to the dimensions of the problems and goals being addressed; construction of appropriate organizational structures for dealing with problems; delineation of alternative methods; evaluation of their potential costs and benefits; establishment of policies; implementation of adopted policies; evaluation of results and modifications of actions in the light of experience.

Instead of attempting to order this field of practice according to methodologies, we suggest that, of all the dimensions which enter into practice, the one which appears to account for the greatest variation is the organizational context in which the activity is conducted.

There is widespread recognition among practitioners that the specific organizational situation sets both the opportunities and constraints that govern the practitioner's operations. This approach suggests the importance of exploring the relationships of such organizational variables as structure, function, ideology, and sociocultural position to strategy, tactics, and practitioner roles. In keeping with our earlier observations, we are not suggesting that these relationships will hold consistently, since there are many dimensions which vary independently of one another. The framework is a heuristic device which both permits an ordering of much of the content of practice and offers a general guide to the practitioner in making judgments and choices based on situational analyses. The focus on organizational contexts helps to identify the factors that need to be taken into account in making these analyses.

Three contexts of practice constitute our framework: voluntary assocations, service agencies, and planning and allocating organizations. The three kinds of organizations are distinguished by their structure or form and by the central function or task

characteristically associated with each. Voluntary associations cover a wide variety of groups and organizations, ranging from informal to formal, which are based on a common interest in achieving a change or improvement in existing social arrangements, relationships, or institutions. A service agency is a formal bureaucratic organization which has as its central purpose the provision of a service to a designated target population. Planning and allocating organizations are networks of formal organizations; their central function is the determination of how to organize and deploy resources to deal with social problems.

Each of the contexts contains within it a range of purposes, ideologies, and other factors that determine the specific approaches and activities that are undertaken. The commonality in practice, to the extent that it exists within each of the contexts, derives from the practitioner's central task. Thus, his basic job in working with voluntary associations is to build and develop the association and to help increase its effectiveness in obtaining its objectives. The task in the service agency is conducting relationships between the service system and the community in which it is based, which includes the clientele that it serves. Finally, the practitioner in allocating and planning organizations is responsible for the articulation of needs and resources within an interorganizational system.

We cannot do much more here than list in staccato form some of the issues and characteristics of practice in each of the three contexts. In voluntary associations, a major distinction can be made between practice with lower class populations, who are lacking in power and other resources, and practice with middle class and affluent organizations. Differences in participation patterns and in ideology can be related to the socio-economic class of participants. These differences, in turn affect the ways in which professional staff is used by an association. An important issue concerns the degree of independence of an organization from centers of political and economic power. Goals vary: some are concerned with building the organization and its power base; others with accomplishing some immediate and clearly defined task or with developing a self-help program. Often goals are not clearly defined and the same voluntary association often pursues a number of objectives and uses various strategies.

Practice with a service organization consists in part of efforts to obtain the resources, including clients, needed to operate the agency. Another set of functions has to do with modification and development of services. This requires the operation of an intelligence system to keep the agency informed of changes in its environment. The information that is gathered

and analyzed--and this includes pressures and demands from clients and from other organizations--provides the basis for policy and program decisions. Significant issues that confront practitioners in these settings concern structure, particularly questions of centralization vs. decentralization of operations and of decision-making.

Planning and allocating organizations include planning within specific program or problem areas, planning across various fields at the local community level under both voluntary and governmental auspices, and large scale social planning at the state and national level. In all of these settings practitioners are concerned with issues of coordination, allocation of resources, and innovation or change. They all operate within a system of interorganizational relationships involving various types or degrees of dependency and interdependency among the formal organizations that constitute the system. The practitioner has two major types of responsibilities. One is to serve as an expert in assessing problems and needs and devising rational plans to deal with them. The other is expertness in the "political" aspects of interorganizational relationships and influence patterns so as to evaluate the feasibility of plans and to help devise measures to increase the rationality of solutions.

The three contexts of practice are linked in many ways. The interrelationships among them are circular and interactive.

Modifications may originate in any of the three contexts but almost inevitably have repercussions in the other two. The practitioner, who may be located at various points in this system, is both a participant in the process of making choices and an expert in helping to clarify and implement them. His distinctive role is to help make the value choices explicit, tracing the implications and consequences of alternative decisions, and developing the programmatic implementations of the choices made. Practitioners necessarily function within the framework of values of the groups that they identify themselves with and agree to serve. They are, nevertheless, change agents, seeking to affect the total system of relationships in which they are involved in order to achieve their social objectives more effectively.

The practitioner engages in a complex "situational analysis," in which he must identify the value commitments--both his own and others--that are present, and form an estimate as to the direction and the possibility of desirable change. The choices of strategy and tactics are the key decisions facing practitioners, and they involve considerations both of what is desirable in itself and what is calculated to achieve a preferred result.

Within each of the three broad organizational contexts of practice--voluntary associations, service agencies, and planning and allocating organizations--there are two general categories of tasks which a practitioner performs. For one we use the term

analytical, which refers to the rational problem-solving processes which the practitioner must follow in order to make choices as to what he will do when, and how. To make such choices he must analyze the situation in which he finds himself, the problem he is trying to overcome or the objective that he is trying to achieve, and the relevant conditions in the environment which affect the nature of that problem and the possibilities of achieving his objective.

The other type of tasks, to which we give equal weight, is interactional, a term that connotes the actions undertaken by the practitioner in relationships with other people --to communicate his proposals and ideas, to elicit their thinking and activity, to provide the atmosphere, conditions, and resources which make it possible for others to pursue agreed upon objectives. The interactional tasks which are undertaken by the practitioner are guided and evaluated by the analytical processes in which he is involved. Analysis guides action and action provides the basis for analysis. The interrelationship in a disciplined approach to practice is essential and continuous.

The practice we have been describing is qualitatively different from clinical practice with individuals, families and small groups. We see the need therefore for an educational concentration in community organization and social planning.

Because we think of this field not simply as a method, we have couched our curriculum recommendations in terms of all the content that is relevant to this concentration, whether that content is now located within the methods sequence or in other sections of the curriculum. The Project has addressed itself to the question of what concentrators in community organization need to know, not only in regard to community organization and social planning methods, but in all areas of social work knowledge.

In the recommendations that follow, a distinction will be made between foundation courses and practice courses. Foundation courses are designed to provide the student with background knowledge that is relevant to practice but is not part of practice itself. Practice courses are designed to equip the student to enter professional practice and to perform at least at the beginning level of such practice.

Since foundation courses are broader than practice, they are not necessarily limited to students concentrating in community organization. They include:

1. Social science
2. Social research
3. Social welfare and social policy
4. The profession of social work

The practice courses include:

One survey course on community organization and social planning.
Specialized courses in different aspects of community organization and social planning.

Many students entering schools of social work at the present time have a reasonably good undergraduate background in the basic social sciences. This should make it unnecessary to offer introductory courses in the social sciences as is frequently done today. Schools should, however, have available, preferably through the social science faculties of their universities rather than through their direct offerings, a series of introductory courses or an omnibus selection of the social science disciplines in order to make it possible for students to fill in the gaps in their undergraduate education.

If one conceives of a common framework for all the methods of social work, then it follows that the social science base is common to all methods. Much of social work education has proceeded on that assumption. The Human Growth and Social Environment sequence has provided this base almost universally and departures from that pattern have begun to take place only recently. While schools have tried in recent years to change that sequence so that it embraces all aspects of behavioral science, its perspective is primarily that of individual behavior.

The field of community organization and social planning as defined in these curriculum recommendations requires a different theoretical framework. By linking community organization with social planning, we are locating practice clearly in the area of

organizational behavior. Within the broad range of practice covered by our definition, it is possible to distinguish "micro" and "macro" levels. At the "micro" end of the spectrum, practice borders on group work in its emphasis on small-group interactions. The distinction which we propose is in the purpose of the intervention. In group work it would tend to be the improvement of relationships among the group members as well as their effectiveness as individuals. In community organization and social planning, the focus is on the greater effectiveness of the group and its organizational performance. The other elements play a part, but as means rather than ends.

While the distinction between group work and the "micro" level of community organization and social planning is admittedly tenuous, it becomes more real when one looks at the "macro" end of the community organization spectrum. Here practice is concerned with institutional change and methodology involves assessing needs, developing programs, and allocating resources. While individual motivations are involved here as they are in every aspect of human behavior, they do not represent the important variables with which the practitioner is concerned.

It is recommended that the social science base for community organization and social planning consist of two elements related respectively to the "micro" and "macro" aspects of the field. They are:

1. Social Behavior. Content is drawn from psychology, social psychology, anthropology, and micro-sociology. The focus is on the behavior of people in relation to social systems and includes such subjects as role theory, group dynamics, small group behavior, decision making, and interpersonal behavior as related to communication, influence, class stratification, etc.

2. Institutional Analysis. Relevant social science knowledge pertaining to institutions, drawn from macro-sociology, economics, and political science. Substantive areas range from sociology of the community, organizational theory, and power structure to urban economics and political systems. The treatment will include processes of institutional growth, equilibrium, and change as well as the allocation of social functions among institutions.

The Project recommends that a number of formats be available in the social science offerings in accordance with different practice emphases that schools will develop. Some may choose to stress organization and planning at the level of the local community and will select social science content that is relevant to that focus. Others may emphasize large-scale social planning and would want, for example, more work in economics. Experimentation along these lines is highly desirable, since it will help to advance the general goal of integrating social science theory with social work practice.

Social research is a basic tool of the organizer and planner, much as diagnosis is a tool of the caseworker. Data analysis is the principal analytic tool informing all aspects of the problem solving process. The research sequence should help students understand the values and uses of research as an effective instrument in problem identification, a device for obtaining needed information, a convenient entree to the community, and a way of influencing power centers. Two courses are recommended. The first would be an introduction, dealing with the language and the logic of research, the design of research for different purposes, and the current status of research in social welfare. The second course would concentrate on methods of collecting and analyzing data and on problems of measurement. Additional courses should be available on an elective basis.

There is a trend at the present time toward advancing and deepening the level of courses for all social work students in social welfare and social policy. The foundation courses in these areas do not need to be qualitatively different for community organization concentrators, but because these are crucial subjects for this field, the content needs to be more extensive and intensive, requiring a minimum of two semester courses.

The framework of one course is a historic and institutional analysis of social welfare, which is both descriptive and critical. The basic outline of such an approach was established some years ago by Wilensky and Lebeaux, and there is a growing body of

literature that both fills in the historical background and develops the critical analysis of the functions of social welfare, and their relationship to economic, political, and social systems. Recent works of Lubove, Mencher and Klein are cases in point.

The course would include a review of the major contemporary policy issues in social welfare. The second course continues directly from the first, building upon the introduction to policy issues, by examining them more intensively, and with a view to providing the student with learning experiences in making a policy analysis and evaluation. A number of models for such analysis have been developed by Wickenden, Rein, Kahn, Fagin, and others.

One function of the curriculum is to socialize the student into the profession of social work. Our recommendations view the profession developmentally and sociologically and look upon social work goals as a manifestation of the profession's assigned societal functions or mandate. External demands and internal differentiation result in the emergence of new specializations of skill and function as the profession seeks to adapt to its environment--community organization and social planning being one of these specializations. Conversely, internal forces also seek to maintain the unity of the profession and its sense of continuity with its history and tradition.

We suggest therefore a course dealing with the sociology of social work. Such a course would be conceptually and pedagogically much more sound than the "casework and group work for community organizers" approach. It would sensitize students to the functions

of their specialization within an emerging anddeveloping profession. It is of the greatest importance that community organization students have the opportunity to observe the techniques and settings of casework, group work and other methods of practice. But they should look at these from the perspective of their community organization and social planning functions rather than being given a limited and inadequate experience in what the caseworkers and group workers do.

We come now to practice courses which deal directly with the content of the tasks to be performed by the practitioner. Their objective is to integrate knowledge, methodology and skill. The format consists of three elements:

1. A survey course that is an introduction to the full range of practice in community organization and social planning, combined with a community laboratory observatory.

2. Specialized courses in community organization and social planning, each of which elaborates the content of a specific area of practice and incorporates elements designed to provide training in application skills.

3. Field placements, supported by seminars, that are designed to provide a sustained experience in an organizing and planning process.

In addition to learning about the background and current content of the field of practice, the survey course should introduce the student directly to practice. The Project has outlined a community laboratory-observatory to be integrated closely with the survey course. The laboratory would consist of 15-18 students, assigned,

individually or in teams, to different settings--community development, social action, direct service agencies (both voluntary and governmental), funds and councils, governmental planning agencies, and political bodies, among others.

With the school maintaining active direction and supervision, the students would carry out structured assignments whose purpose would be to deepen their understanding of the field and to begin to acquire the analytical and interactional skills of practice. A typical assignments would be analysis of client needs, based on hard data combined with opinion surveys and direct observation. Although they will be assigned to a specific agency for some of their learning experiences, they will be there as independent observers and analysts.

Following the survey course, the emphasis shifts to courses that focus on the acquisition of skills. The Project has outlined some of the options that are available to different schools, depending upon their interests and capabilities. The three broad organizational contexts that the Project identified in its framework provide one set of categories. Another is a geographical division--community organization and social planning at the level of the neighborhood, city, state, or nation. Some schools may wish to become more specialized and to offer a course which is limited to the organization of low income populations in urban neighborhoods; or organization and planning in specific problem or program areas, such as poverty or mental health; or planning within governmental settings. Still another approach would be to organize

courses on the basis of subprocesses, such as a course in "process of organizing" which deals with the similarities and differences in organizing low income neighborhoods, middle class interest groups, or governmental commissions.

In order to facilitate the construction of courses in a variety of forms, the Project has developed a list of some 25 skill units, grouped under these seven major categories:

Organizing
Planning and policy-making
Political and legislative skills
Interpersonal and small group skills
Administrative skills
Strategy design and implementation
Promotion and communication

For each of the skill units, a number of learning experiences have been suggested including both class and field work. To expand the possibilities for class exercises, examples of simulation and programmed instruction are suggested. In the methods courses, each field experience is tied to a specific skill unit. Some can be built into the training centers which several schools are now developing under their own auspices. Others may be done as part of a consultation service provided by the school to groups or agencies. Others may best be done under the auspices of a specific agency, by farming students out to them, with the school, however, maintaining responsibility for defining and supervising the experience. Others may be done by an instructor and a class as a completely independent venture.

The need for more sustained field experience is not eliminated by these proposals. However, with the introduction of discrete,

laboratory types of assignments, the field placement will be more sharply defined as providing training in the conduct of a holistic process of organization and planning, as well as contributing to the professional development of the student. It is proposed that both the second year and the summer which intervenes between the two years be used for a combination of concurrent and block placements as well as paid employment that will provide students with this type of experience.

In community organization, unlike casework and group work, there is great irregularity in the flow of work. The traditional field work pattern of two or three days in the field setting seems more ritualistic than realistic. The field assignment should be programmed in relation to the tasks to be undertaken. While this poses problems, it is relaistic in terms of exposure to the kinds of situations that have to be confronted in practice in meeting irregular and often conflicting pressures.

Considerable diversity will also be necessary in the organization of the faculty for field instruction. A general principle to be applied is that there should be no field experience that is not accompanied by a faculty-led seminar or tutorial that involves a review and analysis of the experience and an exploration of its relationship to other curriculum content in theory, research, and practice. There are many ways of achieving this objective; one is through field instruction units that are led by a member of the faculty who takes responsibility both for the supervision of

the student's actual performance in the field as well as his academic instruction. Another is to have the student's performance supervised by agency personnel but to have a faculty member review it with the student on a systematic basis. It is also possible to have seminars led jointly by academic faculty and agency supervisors.

Some grouping of field work students is also desirable. This can be accomplished by organizing seminars for those whose placements have some significant element in common, e.g. similarity in context of practice, or a common system or network of services and institutions. Several schools already provide a number of excellent examples of innovations along these lines.

We have outlined a limited core curriculum in our recommendations, leaving maximum scope for options. Students should have, we feel, substantial freedom to choose elective courses in line with their special interests. These courses may be offered within the school or taken in other departments such as the law school, school of environmental design, urban planning institute, graduate programs in sociology, political science or economics. Similarly, students from other schools should be encouraged to take the courses offered by the school of social work. Some of these courses, with a focus on program and policy formation, can be built around a field of practice such as mental health or corrections or around a social problem such as delinquency or "powerlessness". There is need for experimenting with different formats.

It is not essential that any single school try to cover the whole range of practice and the tendency for schools to emphasize particular aspects of practice should be expected and encouraged. This assumption of greater responsibility by each school for shaping its specific goals and its particular curriculum is consistent with the current trend of thinking about curriculum within the Council on Social Work Education.

We began this paper by looking back to the early 1960's and to the demands that were being made then for a large number of people equipped to work in many different kinds of settings and with effective skills in organizing, planning and policy development. These demands have persisted and indeed expanded both quantitatively and qualitatively. Schools of social work have a heavy responsibility to respond to those demands by training people in community organization and social planning who can contribute to the resolution of the grave social problems of our times.